

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-11 and 13-20 have been amended. Claim 12 has been cancelled, without prejudice.

Requested Action

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider claims 1-11 and 13-20 and withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,015,054), in view of Tamaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,791,616).

Claims 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. in view of Constantin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,154,622).

Claim 19 was rejected technically under 35 U.S.C. §101 as failing to recite that the program is a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium.

Applicants respectfully traverse those rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Foote et al. is not a true teaching reference, in that it relates to combining images captured by a plural cameras to display either a list of captured images or one big image

generated from the captured images. Foot et al. mentions amending a distortion by overlapping a mesh image to the captured images when combining the captured images. Foot et al. essentially is limited to displaying an image and a mesh or dividing an image by using a mesh. Foot et al. totally fails to disclose or suggest generating “a mesh image” other than an input image, as has been emphasized in each of amended Claims 1, 11 and 17.

Tamaki et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Foot et al., in that it relates to printing a calibration pattern and capturing the printed image. To accomplish that purpose, Tamaki et al. calculates parameters for transforming the captured image in order to generate an ideal calibration pattern. Tamaki et al. merely disclose capturing grids and correct them. Tamaki et al. does not at all teach or suggest generating “a mesh image” in the apparatus which is specified in that document.

Constantin et al. also does not cure the deficiencies of Foot et al. in that it relates to a system which scans images and then categorically stores them, in a server. Constantin et al. specifically describes that stored documents are encrypted or converted into a general format, such as JPEG.

Hence, the cited references, either viewed alone or collectively, do not at all disclose generating mesh image data and adding mesh image data to the input image data as one of image components, as cited in each of independent Claims 1, 11 and 17 of the present invention.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Any fee required in connection with this paper should be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Warren E. Olsen/
Warren E. Olsen, Reg. No. 27,290
Gary M. Jacobs, Reg. No. 28,861
Attorneys for Applicant
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
WEO:kag

FCHS_WS 1830842v1